

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/701,753	KAWAHARA, ISAO	

All Participants: _____ **Status of Application:** _____

(1) David L Lewis. (3) _____

(2) David Zoetwey. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 18 March 2005 **Time:** 2:00pm

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

claim 2 rejection

Claims discussed:

2

Prior art documents discussed:

Hirakawa and Ukai

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 BIPIN SHALWALA
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant agreed to amend claim 2 to place the case in condition for allowance. Applicant agreed to include the language "when the plurality of sub-fields are arranged in ascending order of luminance weight with the i^{th} smallest luminance weight being denoted by W_i ," This amendment clears up the 112 problem with W_i 's definition. The claims are allowable over the prior art of record. The Applicants arguments filed on 8/3/2004 are persuasive.